

REMARKS

1. Status of the Claims:

Claims 1, 6, 26-29, 32-36 and 39 are pending in the application.

As indicated in the final Office Action mailed on November 21, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 26-29, 32-36 and 39. No claims have been allowed.

2. Response under 35 CFR 1.116

In response to the final Office Action, reconsideration of the final rejection and amendment of the claims is requested.

Previously presented claims 1, 6, 33-36, and 39 are proposed to be amended.

This response seeks to convince the Examiner to remove the rejection of the claims in the final Office action, or failing that to place the claims (as amended) in better form for appeal.

The response is being filed within two months of the mailing date of the final Office Action.

3. The proposed amendments to claims 1, 6, 33-36 and 39 should be entered.

The proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 6, 33-36, and 39 place the amended claims in better form for appeal by clarifying the issues for appeal in regard to the Examiner's rejection. Moreover, the proposed amendments do not raise any new issue that requires further examination and/or search. This is particularly so since the proposed amendments do not add any claim features that have not already been examined and that are not included in the previously presented versions of the claims.

For example, the proposed amendment to claim 1 simply makes claim 1 more-clearly consistent with the recitation in the previously presented version of the claim of "adjusting the light output from the LED subsets as a function of applied voltage or supplied current in accordance with their corresponding light-output corrections". No change in scope is proposed.

Also, the proposed amendment to dependent claims 33-36 and 39 merely corrects an obvious typing error.

4. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 6, 29, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sawada (JP 8-39860).

Sawada

Based on the translation from Japanese to English of Sawada, provided by the Examiner, Sawada appears to disclose the following method steps (in succession) for equalizing the exposure energy of a plurality of LED subsets 10-1, 10-2, and 10-3:

1. applying an initial drive current to the respective LEDs in the subset;
2. measuring the light-emission quantity of each LED;
3. temporarily allotting the same time "correction" bit to every LED, based on the measured light-emission quantity of each LED, to make the supply time for the drive current applied to the respective LEDs uniform;
4. calculating the exposure energy of the respective LEDs based on the temporary time "correction" bit and the applied drive current;
5. calculating the average exposure energy of the subsets based on the exposure energy of the respective LEDs;
6. comparing the average exposure energy of the subsets with a predetermined desired value;
7. altering the applied drive current for the respective LEDs based on the comparison in step 6, and if the average exposure energy of the respective LEDs is not then the same as the predetermined desired value, repeating steps 2-6 until the average exposure energy of the respective LEDs is the same as the predetermined desired value; and
8. operating the respective LEDs using the altered drive current.

If the Examiner disagrees with this estimate of the method steps 1-8 disclosed in Sawada, he is requested to point out any disagreement(s) and to indicate why he disagrees. This is necessary in order to clarify and focus the issues for further prosecution and/or appeal.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 as proposed to be amended is as follows:

1 (currently amended). A method for tailoring light output from light emitting diodes (LEDs) in a printer or electrographic copier that exposes a charge 1 photosensitive member to light from the LEDs, the method comprising:

calculating a light-output correction for each of a plurality of subsets of the LEDs, each subset being controlled by a respective one of a plurality of different controllers, each light-output correction for one of the LED subsets being calculated based at least upon factors pertaining to (a) a light output from the one LED subset associated with the light-output correction being calculated for that subset, and (b) an average light output from the plurality of subsets of the LEDs, wherein each light-output correction for one of the LED subsets facilitates correction of the light output from its associated LED subset as a function of applied voltage or supplied current; and

adjusting the light output from the LED subsets as a function of applied voltage or supplied current in accordance with their corresponding light-output corrections,

wherein each of the plurality of subsets of the LEDs includes more than one LED.

In order to understand the Examiner's reading of claim 1 on Sawada, he is requested to indicate how he reads each method step in the claim on one of the method steps 1-8 of Sawada as provided above. This is necessary in order to clarify and focus the issues for further prosecution and/or appeal.

Differences between Claim 1 and Sawada

Claim 1 as proposed to be amended calls for "calculating a light-output correction for each of a plurality of subsets of the LEDs" and "each light-output correction for one of the LED subsets being calculated based at least upon factors pertaining to (a) a light output from the one LED subset associated with the light-output correction being calculated for that subset". In contrast, in Sawada any light-output correction that the Examiner construes to be disclosed in Sawada would be a *single* light-output correction for *all* of the LED subsets. See the method steps 1 -8. provided above in connection with Sawada.

This distinction between claim 1 and Sawada is further realized by the previously presented recitation in claim 1 "adjusting the light output from the

LED subsets as a function of applied voltage or supplied current in accordance with their corresponding light-output corrections". Where in Sawada is there any disclosure of adjusting the light-output of the LED subsets in accordance with *respective light-output corrections for the LED subsets*?

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6 recites features that differ from Sawada in ways similar to those provided above in regard to the differences between claim 1 and Sawada.

The Dependent Claims

For the sake of brevity, this response omits any discussion of the dependent claims. However, the right to present differences between the dependent claims and the cited art is preserved in regard to further prosecution and/or appeal.

CONCLUSION

This response seeks to convince the Examiner to remove the final rejection of the claims. Failing that, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s) in the event that a telephone interview will expedite prosecution of the application towards allowance or reduce the issues for purposes of an appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 30,700

Robert Luke Walker/amb
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2739
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.